REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 4-6 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 5 and 6 are added. Support for the new claims can be found, for example, on page 2, lines 17-21, page 4, lines 4-20, and page 8, lines 15-18 of Applicants' specification. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,580 to Autermann ("Autermann") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0263316 to Dix et al. ("Dix"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Autermann and Dix, alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose and would not have rendered obvious the features recited in independent claim 1. For example, Autermann and Dix fail to disclose and would not have rendered obvious "An antitheft apparatus for a vehicle, which is installed on a vehicle and configured to allow operation of predetermined on-vehicle devices only when a user ID code obtained from a user of the vehicle and a reference ID code registered on the vehicle are identical," as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited features in independent claim 4.

The Office Action asserts on page 4, lines 5-10 that Autermann discloses an antitheft apparatus for a vehicle. Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of Autermann. In particular, Autermann discloses an apparatus and method for adjusting mirrors, seat positions, steering columns, and other driver-specific devices and does not disclose an antitheft apparatus (see col. 1, lines 5-7 of Autermann). Autermann also discloses that other devices which can be set include the driver's cab, temperature regulators of the heating and air-conditioning systems, the radio receiver and/or transmitter channel and volume selection, driving strategy, maximum speed, motor setting, and economy parameters (see col. 3, liens 21-31 of Autermann). Autermann discloses that the personal setting-parameter set are stored in a central processor and automatically reactivated when the next

user uses a vehicle or machine. Such systems do not relate to the prevention of entry into the vehicle or access to the components of the vehicle. Thus, Autermann discloses an apparatus and method for adjusting driver-specific devices and does not disclose an antitheft apparatus for a vehicle having the features recited in independent claims 1 and 4.

Furthermore, an anti-theft apparatus relates to preventing access to a vehicle and is unrelated to the operations performed by the system of Autermann. The system Autermann facilitates operation of a driver-specific setting of vehicle devices that are used from within the vehicle and during the operation of the vehicle. Thus, Autermann fails to disclose an anti-theft apparatus for a vehicle having the features recited in independent claims 1 and 4.

Dix fails to overcome the deficiencies of Autermann because one of ordinary skill would not have combined Autermann and Dix to achieve the claimed subject matter. The March 17, 2011 Advisory Action asserts that because a vehicle can include multiple systems with different functionalities one of ordinary skill in the art may include the vehicle access control system of Dix in the apparatus of Autermann to further enhance the features available on a vehicle. Dix discloses a reprogrammable vehicle access control system in which one or more individual operator smart keys can be programmed when it is determined that a master smart key is in the vehicle (see Abstract of Dix). In contrast, as discussed above, the system of Autermann is related to driver-specific settings that relate to the operation of the vehicle and is not related to the prevention of access to the vehicle. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the programmable vehicle access control system of Dix with the system of Autermann because the systems are unrelated. Therefore, the combination of Autermann and Dix would not have rendered obvious all of the features positively recited in independent claims 1 and 4.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. Therefore, claim 3 is also patentable over the references at least for its dependence from claim 1 as well as for the additional features claim 3 recites.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

New claims 5 and 6 are patentable over the applied references at least based on the dependency from independent claims 1 and 4, respectively, as well as for the additional features claims 5 and 6 recite.

In particular, Autermann and Dix fail to disclose that "the communications station is located outside of the vehicle," as recited in claims 5 and 6. The Office Action appears to assert that the central processor ZP corresponds to the claimed communications station.

However, Autermann does not disclose that the central processor ZP or the local processor LP are located outside of the vehicle. Similarly, Dix fails to disclose the above recited features because Dix discloses an electronic controller that is located in the vehicle (see Abstract and Fig. 1 of Dix). Thus, claims 5 and 6 are patentable over Autermann and Dix.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Vitaliy L. Orekhov Registration No. 66,731

JAO:VLO/emd

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination Petition for Extension of Time

Date: April 14, 2011

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 320850 Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850 Telephone: (703) 836-6400 DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;

Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461